



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/760,404	01/12/2001	William T. Daniell	10004554-1	1751

7590 04/21/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

ZIA, SYED

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/760,404

Applicant(s)

DANIELL ET AL.

Examiner

Syed Zia

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/22/2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

This office action is in response to request of reconsideration and argument filed on November 15, 2004. Applicant currently amended claims 1-3, 5, and 8-14. Applicant added new claims 15-22. The amendment filed have been entered and made of record. Presently pending claims are 1-22.

Therefore, presently Claims 1-22 are pending for further consideration.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed on November 15, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

Regarding Claims 1-22 applicants argued that the cited prior art (CPA) [Hayes (U. S. Patent 6,339,826)] does not teach, "a context switch is performed in response to a detection of an operational problem or that any request for changing from one sate of alleged security profile to another is provided in response to an operational problem".

This is not found persuasive. Cited prior art clearly teaches system and method for a list of applications to which the user has access permission, and objects corresponding to each application in the list are downloaded. The objects when selected by the user, a request for

Art Unit: 2131

downloading corresponding application to the user station are outputted to server. Log-on request including user identifier is received at the server from a user station. The server uses the users log-on identifier to build a list of applications for which the user has access permission. Therefore, the system of prior art provides common repository for configuration information for users and applets in client-server environment. Allows user to login from any computer in the system at any time and have it configured automatically at run time according to *preferences* stored for the user at the server. Prevents user from winding up with applications configured on desktop to which user does not have access by *testing each application access preference* set by user against the application permission present on server.

As a result, the system of cited prior art provides a system and method for automatically implementing a security profile that has been previously implemented within the computer system.

Applicants clearly have failed to explicitly identify specific claim limitations, which would define a patentable distinction over prior arts.

The examiner is not trying to teach the invention but is merely trying to interpret the claim language in its broadest and reasonable meaning. The examiner will not interpret to read narrowly the claim language to read exactly from the specification, but will interpret the claim language in the broadest reasonable interpretation in view of the specification. Therefore, the examiner asserts that cited prior art does teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent and dependent claims. Accordingly, rejections for Claims 1-22 are respectfully maintained.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hayes et al, hereinafter Hayes (USP 6,339,826).

As per claims 1, 8, and 9, Hayes teaches: memory (Fig 2, element 212), and a security application configured to lock down resources of said computer system (col. 19, lines 50-55) by modifying a machine state of said computer system in response to a request for activating an original state of a security profile for a user, said security application configured to store data indicative of said machine state in said memory (col. 17, lines 60-64), said security application configured to modify said machine state (col. 20, lines 1-5) in response to a request for activating a new state of said security profile *for said user* (col. 12, lines 34-46, col.7 lines 62-63), said security application configured to retrieve said data in response to a request for recovering said original state of said security profile and to modify said machine state based on said retrieved

Art Unit: 2131

*data thereby activating said original state of said security profile for said user* (col. 7, lines 67 col. 8, lines 5).

As per claim 22, Hayes teaches memory (Fig 2, element 212), and a security application configured to define a security profile for controlling access to at least one resource of said computer system (col. 19, lines 50-55), said security application configured to activate an original state of said security profile and to store data indicative of said original state in said memory (col. 17, lines 60-64), said security application further configured to activate a new state of said security profile (col. 7, lines 62-64), col.20 lines 1-5) in response to a user request (col. 12, lines 34-46), said security application further configured to enable a user to undo an error in defining said new state by allowing said user to initiate activation of said original state based on said data (col. 7, lines 67 col. 8, lines 5, col.19 line 16 to line 26).

As per claims 2 and 10, Hayes teaches said security application includes default data defining default levels of security (col. 7, line 16), wherein said security application enables a user to select one of said default levels of security (col. 7, lines 16-19), and wherein said security application is configured to modify said machine state in response to said request for activating said original state of said security profile based on said selected default level of security (col. 17, lines 60-64).

As per claims 3 and 11, Hayes teaches said security application defines a plurality of rules for locking down said computer system (col. 7, Lines 17-18), wherein said security application

Art Unit: 2131

configured to enable ones of said rules based on which of said default levels is selected by said user (col. 7, lines 54-55), and wherein said security application is further configured to cause said computer system to enforce each enabled rule within said plurality of rules by modifying said machine state in response to said request for activating said original state of said security profile (col. 19, lines 50-55).

As per claims 4 and 12, Hayes teaches said security application enables said user to change which of said rules are enabled (col. 7, lines 16-17).

As per claims 5 and 13, Hayes teaches memory (Fig 2, element 212), and a security application defining a plurality of said rules (col. 7, lines 18-19), said security application configured to enable a user to select a set of said rules to define an original state of a security profile for a user (col. 7, lines 17), said security application configured to lock down said computer system by causing said computer system to enforce said selected set of rules in response to an activation request (col. 19, lines 50-55), said security application further configured to store data indicative of said original state of said security profile (col. 17, lines 60-64), said security application configured to change said security profile for said user from said original state to a new state by changing which of said plurality of rules are enforced by said computer system based on inputs to said computer system (col. 12, Lines 33-40), said security application configured to retrieve said data in response to a user request and to automatically identify said set of rules based on said retrieved data (col. 17, Lines 65-66), said security application further configured to return said

Art Unit: 2131

security profile for said user to said original state thereby causing said computer system to enforce said identified rules in response to said user request (col. 19, line 53).

As per claims 6 and 14, Hayes teaches said security application is further configured to define multiple sets of default data (col. 7, Lines 15-16), each of said sets of default data identifying different ones of said rules as being enabled for enforcement (col. 7, Lines 17-18), said security application configured to enable said user to select one of said sets of default data and to determine which of said rules are selected for inclusion into said selected set of rules based on which of said rules are indicated as enabled (col. 7, Lines 54-65).

As per claim 7, Hayes teaches said security application enables said user to change which of said rules are indicated as being enabled (col. 7, lines 16-17).

As per claim 15, Hayes teaches said original state grants access to a particular resource of said computer system based on a user identifier, and wherein said new state denies access to said particular resource based on said user identifier (col.20 line 36 to line 45).

As per claim 16, Hayes teaches an operating system configured to read said machine state modified by said security application and to control access to at least one resource of said computer system based on said machine state (col.20 line 55 to line 61).



Art Unit: 2131

As per claim 17, Hayes teaches said machine state read by said operating system comprises a flag indicative of whether access to said at least one resource is restricted (col.14 line 54 to col. 15line 5).

As per claim 18, Hayes teaches said operating system is configured to analyze, in response to said flag, data indicating which users are authorized to access said at least one resource (col.14 line 50 to col.15 line 5).

As per claim 19, Hayes teaches said security application, by activating said original state in response to said request for recovering said original state, enables said user to undo an error in defining said new state of said security profile for said user (col.19 line 16 to line 26).

As per claim 20, Hayes teaches detecting an operational problem caused by activation of said new state of said security profile; and providing said request for recovering said original state of said security profile in response to said detecting (col.19 line 16 to line 26, and col.9 line 30 to line 41).

As per claim 21, Hayes teaches said storing is in response to said request for activating said original state of said security profile (col.9 line 13 to line 15 and col. 9 line 30 to line 41).

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Syed Zia whose telephone number is 571-272-3798. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

sz

April 08, 2005

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100